

PROPOSITION

72

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS. REFERENDUM.

OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY

Prepared by the Attorney General

Health Care Coverage Requirements. Referendum.

A “Yes” vote approves, and a “No” vote rejects legislation that:

- Provides for individual and dependent health care coverage for employees, as specified, working for large and medium employers;
- Requires that employers pay at least 80% of coverage cost; maximum 20% employee contribution;
- Requires employers to pay for health coverage or pay fee to medical insurance board that purchases primarily private health coverage;
- Applies to employers with 200 or more employees beginning 1/1/06;
- Applies to employers with 50 to 199 employees beginning 1/1/07. Applies to employers with 20 to 49 employees if tax credit enacted.

Summary of Legislative Analyst’s Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact:

- Expenditures fully offset by fee revenues paid mainly by employers, which could range from tens of millions to hundreds of millions of dollars annually, to fund a new state program primarily to purchase private health insurance coverage.
- Reduction in county health program costs potentially in the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually.
- Uncertain net fiscal impact on state-supported health programs.
- Increased costs potentially in the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually for state and local public agencies to provide additional health coverage for their employees.
- Net reduction in state tax revenues potentially in the low hundreds of millions of dollars.
- In summary, unknown net savings or costs to state and local government.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

BACKGROUND

Health Coverage in California

A majority of Californians under age 65 receive health insurance through their employer or the employer of a family member. Most Californians age 65 and over are covered by the federal Medicare Program. Others purchase health insurance for themselves. Many individuals receiving coverage share in the cost of the premiums paid for their health insurance.

Many low-income persons obtain health care services through the Medi-Cal Program, the Healthy Families Program, or other public programs operated by the state and county governments. Medi-Cal is administered by the state Department of Health Services (DHS), while the Healthy Families Program is administered by the state Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board (MRMIB). However, based upon a 2001 survey, an estimated 6.3 million nonelderly Californians lacked health coverage at some point during the year. These individuals are likely to receive medical assistance from county indigent health care programs or through the charitable activities of health care providers or pay for it themselves. Surveys indicate that of the nonelderly uninsured individuals, more than four out of five are either employed or are family members of someone who is working.

Some of the medical costs incurred by uninsured persons are indirectly shifted by health care providers to others who have health coverage, in effect adding to the cost of their health insurance. There are also indications that the number of employees who are uninsured may be adding to the costs of workers’ compensation insurance, which includes medical coverage for on-the-job injuries.

Recent Legislation

In 2003, the Legislature approved and the Governor signed Senate Bill 2 (Chapter 673) to expand health insurance coverage beginning in 2006 for employees of certain employers and, in some cases, their dependents. The law also established a program to assist lower-income employees with paying their share of health care premiums.

The new law would have gone into effect January 1, 2004. However, Proposition 72, a referendum on this new law, subsequently qualified for the statewide ballot. As a result, SB 2 was put “on hold” and will take effect only if Proposition 72 is approved by the voters at the November 2004 election.

PROPOSAL

If approved, this proposition would allow the provisions of SB 2 to go into effect. Health care researchers have estimated that the provisions of SB 2 could eventually

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS. REFERENDUM.

PROP

72

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST (CONT.)

result in more than 1 million uninsured employees and dependents receiving health coverage. The major provisions of SB 2 are described below.

“Pay or Play” Requirement for Employers

Senate Bill 2 enacts a “pay or play” system of health coverage for certain employers. Under the system, specified California employers would be required to pay a fee to the state to provide health insurance (in other words, “pay”) for their employees and in some cases, for their dependents. Alternatively, the employer could choose to arrange directly with health insurance providers for coverage (in other words, “play”) for these individuals.

Both “pay” and “play” employers are required to pay a fee to the state to support a state health insurance purchasing program. Employers choosing to arrange their own health coverage (in some cases by continuing or modifying the coverage now provided to their employees) would receive a credit that would fully offset their fee. In order for an employer to qualify for a fee offset, the employer would have to provide specified types of coverage. Employers would be responsible for at least 80 percent of the cost of the fee, with the balance borne by their employees. The fee would be collected from employers and the fee requirements enforced by the Employment Development Department (EDD).

Senate Bill 2 would generally apply to both private and public employers, including state government, counties, cities, special districts, and school districts.

Federal law, known as the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, has been interpreted by the courts to generally prohibit states from requiring certain employers to provide health insurance coverage to their employees. As a result, it is possible that the “pay or play” provisions of SB 2 could be challenged in court. Our analysis assumes that the “pay or play” provisions would go into effect.

Who Would Provide and Receive Coverage?

Figure 1 summarizes which employers are affected by the “pay or play” requirements, when they would be subject to the requirements of SB 2, and who would receive health coverage. These requirements depend upon the number of employees an employer has in California. Senate Bill 2 also provides that employers with 20 to 49 employees would be subject to the “pay or play” provisions only if state law were changed to establish a tax credit for those employers equal to 20 percent of their state fee for health coverage. To date, no such tax credit legislation has been enacted, and these employers are

currently exempt from the provisions of SB 2. Employers with 19 or fewer employees within California would not be subject to its requirements.

Any employee who worked more than 100 hours per month for the same employer for three months would qualify for health coverage. Senate Bill 2 defines the list of dependents who could be eligible for coverage to be spouses, minor children, older children who are dependent upon the employee for support, and domestic partners.

Senate Bill 2 imposes penalties on any employer who reduces an employee’s hours of work or takes other steps to avoid having to comply with its “pay or play” requirements.

Contributions by Employees

Employees would generally be required to make a contribution of up to 20 percent of the amount of the fee charged by the state to their employer. Contributions paid by employees would be collected by their employer and transferred to the state.

Low-income employees would have their contributions capped at 5 percent of their wages. Senate Bill 2 defines a low-income employee as an individual who earned wages of less than 200 percent of the federal poverty guidelines—currently about \$19,000 a year in the case of an individual, and about \$31,000 a year in the case of an employee and his or her family.

In addition to these contributions, employees could also be charged part of the additional costs for their coverage in the form of deductibles, copayments, or coinsurance payments in amounts determined by the state. These charges would have to be set at a level that took into account whether the persons would be deterred from obtaining appropriate and timely health care.

State Health Purchasing Program

Senate Bill 2 creates the State Health Purchasing Program to purchase health care coverage for eligible California employees (and their dependents) of employers who opt to pay a fee instead of arranging for health insurance. The purchasing program would be administered by MRMIB. The MRMIB would negotiate contracts with health insurers, primarily private health plans, who agreed to provide health care coverage. The coverage would have to meet existing state standards for health insurance, such as the inclusion of hospital and primary care, and would also include coverage for prescription drugs. The cost of health coverage purchased under the

FIGURE 1

WHICH EMPLOYERS ARE AFFECTED BY THIS MEASURE?

Employers Who Employ Must Provide Health Coverage to . . .	Starting
200 or more employees in the state	Employees and dependents	1/1/06
50 to 199 employees in the state	Employees only	1/1/07
20 to 49 employees in the state	Employees only, if a specified tax credit is enacted	Undetermined
19 or fewer employees in the state	No requirement	Not applicable

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS. REFERENDUM.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST (CONT.)

program, as well as MRMIB's and EDD's administrative costs for the implementation of the program, would be supported with the funds collected from employers and employees under SB 2.

State Premium Assistance

Senate Bill 2 establishes a program to pay the premiums for health coverage provided through the workplace for low-income employees who are eligible for Medi-Cal or the Healthy Families Program. This provision applies to eligible employees for all California employers, and not just those employees of employers affected by the "pay or play" requirements of SB 2. So, for example, eligible employees of employers that provide health coverage and that have fewer than 20 employees would qualify for premium assistance.

Under the premium assistance program, the state and employers would notify employees of the availability of premium assistance and employees may voluntarily provide information to the state that would indicate if they and their families were eligible for coverage under Medi-Cal or the Healthy Families Program. If these persons were subsequently enrolled in either public program, the state could require them to also enroll in any coverage available from their employer, if that were determined by the state to be cost-effective. The state would reimburse these employees for any premiums they paid for the coverage provided by their employer. However, these employees would remain subject to paying any premiums and copayments required under Medi-Cal or the Healthy Families Program.

Employees and their families receiving premium assistance would also receive what is known as "wraparound" coverage from the state. In this case, this means that the state would provide and pay for any additional medical services for an employee or their family that were included in either the Medi-Cal or Healthy Families benefit package (such as dental coverage), but that were not included in the health coverage provided by the employer.

The implementation of the state premium assistance provisions would be the responsibility of MRMIB and DHS, and would be subject to approval by the federal government.

Health Insurance Marketing Provisions

Senate Bill 2 expands to medium-sized employers a series of provisions now in state law that are intended to make it easier and more affordable for small employer groups to purchase health coverage. For example, if a health plan or insurer offered and sold an insurance product to one medium-sized employer, they would be required to offer and sell the same product to other employers of similar size. Senate Bill 2 provides that, should its "pay or play" requirements be invalidated in court, these provisions affecting health coverage purchases by medium-sized employers would also become inoperative.

General Fund Loan

Senate Bill 2 authorizes loans from the state General Fund, subject to appropriation in the annual budget act, for costs incurred by MRMIB and EDD for the

establishment and administration of the State Health Purchasing Fund. The loans are to be repaid with interest within five years after the state begins the collection of fees from employers.

FISCAL EFFECTS

The health coverage requirements of SB 2 would have a number of significant fiscal effects on state and local governments, including counties, cities, special districts, and school districts. In addition, they could have significant effects on individuals and businesses. These effects are complex, uncertain, and difficult to predict over time. Among the factors that could cause savings and costs to vary significantly are:

- How some provisions of SB 2 were eventually implemented by state and local officials and interpreted by the courts.
- The proportion of employers who chose to participate in the State Health Purchasing Program.
- How the health insurance marketplace responded to the new law in the products and prices it offered to public and private purchasers of care.

Given these uncertainties, we believe that the net savings or costs to the state and local governments are unknown. Our estimates assume that SB 2 affects employers with 50 or more employees. The more significant identifiable savings and costs to state and local governments that could result from this SB 2 are summarized below.

Purchasing Program Revenues and Expenditures

The "pay or play" requirements of SB 2 would generate significant revenues to the state from fees paid by employers that chose to "pay" for health coverage rather than to "play" by directly arranging their own health coverage. Also, the state would receive additional revenues from contributions for coverage paid by the employees of the firms choosing to "pay."

The state revenues received from these employers and employees would, in turn, be used to fully offset the costs of the State Health Purchasing Program. The most significant program costs would be for the purchase of health insurance coverage, primarily from private insurers, for employees of these employers (and, in the case of some employers, the dependents of these employees). These state revenues would also be used to fully offset administrative and other costs related to the State Health Purchasing Program.

The proportion of employers who would choose to "pay" the fee to the state, thereby obtaining health coverage from the State Health Purchasing Program, rather than to "play" by arranging health coverage on their own, is a major unknown factor. The choices ultimately made by employers on whether to "pay or play" would have a significant impact on the amount of fee revenue paid to the state as well as the size of the State Health Purchasing Program. We estimate that the amount of fees collected from employers and employees and spent for the purchasing program could range from the tens of millions of dollars to the hundreds of millions of dollars annually, depending on the participation level of employers. This

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS. REFERENDUM.

PROP

72

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST (CONT.)

estimate assumes that the state collects the fee only from firms that choose to “pay” and not from firms that “play” by arranging health coverage on their own and therefore receive a credit that fully offsets their fee.

Effect on Other Publicly Funded Health Programs

State. The net effect of SB 2 on state-funded health programs is uncertain. Some provisions are likely to result in state savings while other provisions are likely to result in costs, as discussed below.

On the one hand, the “pay or play” requirement for employers to either pay a fee to the state or provide health coverage would generally have the effect of reducing state costs for Medi-Cal and Healthy Families benefits. This is because costs for these state-supported health coverage programs would likely decrease as additional employees and dependents received coverage from the State Health Purchasing Program or through coverage arranged by employers.

On the other hand, the premium assistance and wrap-around coverage components of SB 2 would generally have the effect of increasing state costs for Medi-Cal and Healthy Families benefits. These provisions would result in the enrollment of additional employees and dependents in the two programs, additional state expenditures to reimburse employees for the premiums they paid for employer-based coverage, and additional state expenditures for wrap-around coverage.

Taking all of these provisions and their fiscal effects into account, we estimate that the fiscal impact on Medi-Cal benefits would eventually be a net savings to the state amounting to tens of millions of dollars annually. However, we estimate that SB 2 would result in a net cost to the state for Healthy Families Program benefits of roughly the same magnitude. Given the uncertainties associated with SB 2, it is not clear at this time whether it would ultimately result in a net cost or savings to the state for state-supported health benefits.

Local. County costs for providing health care for indigents are likely to decrease significantly as more employees and dependents receive health coverage that is paid for by employers, Medi-Cal, and the Healthy Families Program. We estimate that the implementation of SB 2 would eventually result in savings to county governments on a statewide basis, potentially in the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

State Administrative Costs

Senate Bill 2 specifies that part of the fees collected from employers would be used by MRMIB and EDD to offset their costs for administering the new State Health Purchasing Program. However, under the terms of SB 2, administrative costs incurred by DHS and MRMIB for the premium assistance program are not included among those that would be offset from fee revenue, and thus would probably be supported from the state General Fund and federal funds. We estimate that MRMIB, EDD, and DHS would incur significant administrative costs, probably amounting collectively in the low tens of millions of dollars annually, to implement SB 2.

Costs to Public Employers

The “pay or play” requirements of SB 2 generally apply to public employers, including the state, counties, cities, special districts, and school districts. Although full-time employees of public agencies in California usually have health coverage, some seasonal, temporary, and part-time employees and their dependents currently lack health coverage. We estimate that the additional cost to the state and local agencies to comply with SB 2 could potentially amount to the low hundreds of millions of dollars annually beginning in 2006–07.

These additional costs could be partially offset by savings to public agencies in certain circumstances. For example, some spouses of public agency employees would receive coverage from their own employers as a result of SB 2. Because these spouses would no longer receive coverage as dependents of employees of those public agencies, such agencies could realize some savings on their health coverage costs. The amount of the offsetting savings from this and other factors is unknown.

Effects on State Revenues

Senate Bill 2 would impact state revenues in two major ways.

First, some businesses would face increased operating costs to pay for employees’ health insurance. To the extent that businesses absorb these costs, their taxable income would be less and, thus, income tax revenues would decline. Many employers would act to avoid absorbing these costs, however, such as by “passing them along” to consumers through higher product prices or to employees by cutting back on hours or wages. These steps could reduce overall economic activity, causing declines in personal income taxes and sales taxes. Revenue losses also would occur if California lost economic activity to other states.

Partially offsetting the above factors would be potential revenue gains due to any reduction in the health premiums that otherwise would have been paid by certain employers, as well as expanded economic activity in the health care sector. Current premiums paid by employers for health insurance and workers’ compensation insurance may reflect some “cost-shifting” to cover health care costs of the uninsured. To the extent that SB 2 reduces the number of uninsured persons, it could reduce cost-shifting and could lower premiums paid by employers, thus increasing taxable income. In addition, employers’ costs for complying with SB 2 may be reduced if the State Health Purchasing Program negotiates lower insurance rates, or the health care marketplace itself responds to SB 2 with reduced rates. Finally, the significant expansion of health coverage could increase state tax revenues paid by health plans and insurers.

Taking these and other factors into consideration, SB 2 would likely result in a net reduction in state tax revenues, potentially in the low hundreds of millions of dollars, with the actual magnitude depending on the behavioral responses of employers and the health care marketplace.

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS. REFERENDUM.

ARGUMENT in Favor of Proposition 72

Across California, millions of people are working harder and harder to pay their bills. Worst of all is the skyrocketing cost they pay for health care.

Many companies are forcing employees to pay more for health care through higher premiums or cuts in coverage. For employees, higher insurance costs compete with their mortgage or rent, food, and transportation. Many employees are going without the medical care and prescription drugs their families need, creating a health care crisis in California.

It is simply wrong when employees can't afford health insurance for themselves and their children. 72 makes sure that private health insurance remains within reach.

72 WILL LIMIT WHAT EMPLOYEES PAY FOR HEALTH CARE

- **PROBLEM:** Employees are paying more—not just because of rising health care costs, but also because businesses are shifting a greater share of the burden to their workers. *The amount California families pay for premiums has increased 70% in the last three years.* Last year, employee premiums increased at *twice* the rate of business premiums. Unless something is done, more and more will be passed on to you.
- **SOLUTION:** Under 72, large and medium-sized companies must pay *at least 80%* of the cost of employees' premiums for health insurance.

72 WILL PROVIDE HEALTH INSURANCE TO 1.1 MILLION WORKING PEOPLE AND CHILDREN CURRENTLY UNINSURED

- **PROBLEM:** Some employers do not offer their employees insurance. The number of working people without insurance is increasing.
- **SOLUTION:** 72 requires large and mid-sized employers to pay for health insurance for employees, extending *coverage to an additional 1.1 million working people and their children.*

72 ENSURES COVERAGE YOU NEED

- **PROBLEM:** Already 30% of businesses say they plan to cut benefits. More will follow.

- **SOLUTION:** Under 72, coverage includes *prescription drugs, preventive care, and major medical.*

72 PROTECTS TAXPAYERS

- **PROBLEM:** California taxpayers pay \$4.6 billion annually to cover emergency room and health care bills for the uninsured. Taxpayers will pay even more unless something changes.

- **SOLUTION:** 72 protects taxpayers by providing health care coverage to an additional 1.1 million workers and their children, taking them out of emergency rooms and *placing them in the care of their own doctors.*

72 LEVELS THE PLAYING FIELD FOR RESPONSIBLE COMPANIES

- **PROBLEM:** Companies that *don't* provide affordable health care to their employees have an advantage over companies that *do*.
- **SOLUTION:** 72 *protects responsible companies from unfair competition* by requiring all large and mid-sized companies to pay for health care for employees.

Consumers Union, nonprofit publisher of *Consumer Reports*, says, "After studying Proposition 72, we conclude it is a necessary step forward that protects health coverage for working Californians."

By capping employees' health care premiums, 72 will keep private health insurance within reach of working families.

If nothing changes, workers will continue to pay more and more for health insurance—or lose their coverage. 72 provides an answer. It's a good first step in protecting employer-based health insurance—and the 19 million Californians who depend on it. Visit www.saveyourhealthcare.com.

RICHARD HOLOBER, *Executive Director*
Consumer Federation of California

DEBORAH BURGER, RN, *President*
California Nurses Association

RICHARD F. CORLIN, M.D., *Past President*
California Medical Association & American Medical Association

REBUTTAL to Argument in Favor of Proposition 72

PROPOSITION 72 WILL NOT CONTROL HEALTH COSTS

Health costs are skyrocketing but Proposition 72 WILL NOT control these costs. Proposition 72 makes the problem worse by creating a huge bureaucracy to administer a government-run health care scheme **COSTING EMPLOYERS AND WORKERS** an estimated \$7 BILLION by 2007.

PROPOSITION 72 CREATES A GOVERNMENT-RUN HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

The backers of 72 are hiding the fact it creates a government-run system. Read it for yourself!—"Chapter 3. State Health Purchasing Program." Many people may lose their existing private coverage and end up in the state plan.

The former head of the state board charged with implementing 72 says it won't work:

"Proposition 72 is fatally flawed and poorly structured. It mandates coverage without controlling costs and forces workers and employers to pay whether they can afford to or not. Proposition 72 just doesn't work."

John Ramey, Former Executive Director
Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board

PROPOSITION 72 DOES NOT HELP THE UNINSURED OR TAXPAYERS

We all want to help the uninsured, but Proposition 72 isn't the solution. Up to 500,000 workers' jobs will be at risk if Proposition 72 becomes law. These people could end up unemployed AND uninsured.

THREATENS ACCESS TO YOUR DOCTORS

Under Proposition 72's state plan, you could lose access to your doctors and hospitals and have to be treated by government-approved providers.

Proposition 72 is not the kind of reform we need! **PLEASE JOIN DOCTORS, CHARITIES, EDUCATORS, AND TAXPAYERS—VOTE NO ON 72!**

THOMAS LAGRELIUS, M.D., *President*
California Chapter, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons

GLORIA RIOS, *Director*
California Association of School Business Officials

JON COUPAL, *President*
Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS. REFERENDUM.

PROP

72

ARGUMENT Against Proposition 72

Real health care reform should control costs and cover more people, but Proposition 72 fails that test. Passed by the Legislature with no meaningful hearings and signed by Governor Davis just days before he was recalled, Proposition 72 creates a huge government-run health care system funded by an estimated \$7 billion in new taxes by 2007 on employers and workers.

WORKERS MAY LOSE PRIVATE COVERAGE

Proposition 72 may hurt people who already have health coverage through their employer. You could get forced out of your current plan and into the government-run system! Under Proposition 72 you could lose access to your personal doctor and hospital and end up with a high deductible policy that requires you to pay thousands out of your pocket before getting coverage.

BUREAUCRATS GIVEN TOO MUCH POWER

Under Prop. 72, bureaucrats determine what medical services and providers are covered by the state-run health system and how much you'll pay to support the government-run plan. There are no caps on the administrative fees they can charge. The Orange County Register called it health care with, "the bedside manner of the DMV."

PAY WHETHER YOU WANT IT OR NOT

Proposition 72 is poorly written. You can't decline coverage even if you don't want it or can't afford your share of costs! Employees will pay up to 20% of the cost!

KILLS JOBS/ECONOMY

Proposition 72 will damage California's economy and mean MORE PEOPLE WITHOUT INSURANCE because thousands will lose their jobs as companies close or move out of state. California businesses already struggling with high workers' comp and energy costs just can't afford billions in new health care costs.

COSTS WORKERS \$1,700 PER FAMILY

Covered workers will be forced to pay up to 20% of the premiums. The Los Angeles Economic Development Corporation estimates family coverage will cost workers up

to \$1,700 per year.

Employers must pay 80% of the cost. Many must also pay for dependent coverage, costing over \$6,800 per worker each year.

COSTS SCHOOLS AND NONPROFITS MILLIONS

The Association of California School Administrators says Proposition 72 will cost school districts hundreds of millions annually—money urgently needed in classrooms! Non-profit organizations like Easter Seals and the Goodwill of Long Beach and South Bay oppose Prop. 72 because it makes it harder to provide services to people in need.

Here's how Proposition 72 damages Californians:

"At Easter Seals, the high costs and mandates of Proposition 72 will force us to stop creating new and needed services for people with disabilities."

Gary Kasai, President, Easter Seals Superior California
"Proposition 72 will mandate the worst kind of managed health care we have. This means there will be more and more patients with terrible insurance."

Thomas LaGrelus, M.D., President, California Chapter, Association of American Physicians and Surgeons

"Prop. 72 will discourage those of us who have worked so hard to fulfill the American dream from growing their business and providing more jobs in our communities. Some will simply have to close shop."

C.C. Yin, Restaurant Owner

JOIN EMPLOYERS, EDUCATORS, DOCTORS, NON-PROFITS, AND TAXPAYERS: VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 72!

ALLAN ZAREMBERG, *President*
California Chamber of Commerce

SANDRA CARSTEN, *President*
Association of California School Administrators

JAMES G. KNIGHT, M.D., *2003 President*
San Diego Medical Society

REBUTTAL to Argument Against Proposition 72

Opponents are using scare tactics so voters will be afraid to approve protections for employees. Their claims are false.

SCARE TACTIC: GOVERNMENT HEALTH CARE REPLACES PRIVATE COVERAGE

Prop. 72 sets standards for health coverage and the share of costs employers must pay—just like the minimum wage sets standards for wages.

"Prop. 72 is the opposite of government-run health care. It strengthens private employer health insurance." John Garamendi, *California Insurance Commissioner*

If you already get health insurance from your employer, your employer can keep that same coverage under 72 and can continue to pay up to 100% of premiums. You get the security of knowing your employer cannot pay less than 80% of premiums and must maintain preventive care, prescription drugs, and major medical.

SCARE TACTIC: 72 COSTS MORE

Opponents claim premiums could be \$1,700 under 72. But the average California family ALREADY pays \$2,452 in premiums (*Sacramento Bee*, 3/17/04).

Under 72, the average California family will *save money*.

SCARE TACTIC: JOB KILLER

- Corporate lobbyists always complain about California's business climate, but California is the world's 6th largest economy.
- 93% of California's restaurants and retailers are exempt.
- Businesses will benefit from a healthier, more productive workforce.

IF WE DO NOTHING:

- Employee premiums will keep rising.
- More working families will be uninsured.
- Taxpayers will continue paying health care costs for employees of big companies like Wal-Mart and McDonalds.

Don't be confused by scare tactics. 72 keeps private health care within the reach of California families.

PAUL KIVELA, M.D., *President*
California Chapter American College of Emergency Physicians

BARBARA E. KERR, *President*
California Teachers Association

TOM PORTER, *California State Director*
AARP